

United States Patent and Trademark Office



R

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTO	R	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/939,417	08	8/24/2001	Leonard Forbes		MICRON.154A / 00-0184	4204	
20995	7590	10/29/2003			EXAMINER		
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP					LEWIS, MONICA		
	2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA					2822		

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

~			lf
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advison, Action	09/939,417	FORBES, LEONARD	
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Monica Lewis	2822	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspond nc add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 02 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1, ension and the corresponding amount of the data statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee ttension fee under (2) as set forth in
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).		=	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered		от ино арроан	
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require fur		(see NOTE below):	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note		(000 110 12 00.011),	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or		terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	lld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	` ` `	•	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	rs:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem		<i>_</i>	-
10. Other:		AMIR ZAFABI UPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT	EXAMINER

Continuation Sh et (PTOL-303) 09/939,417



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, Applicant argues that the references do not disclose "a floating gate transistor with a control gate 335 that has no overlap or alignment with the body region in either the vertival or the horizontal directon." However, this language is not found in claim 1. Second, Applicant argues that the references do not disclose "an array of floating gate transistors with control gates that do not overlap or align with body regions." However, this language is not found in claim 9. Finally, Applicant argues that the references do not disclose "a floating gate transistor with a control gate that does not overlap or align with the body region." However, this language is not found in claim 20.